This Page is Inserted by IFW Indexing and Scanning Operations and is not part of the Official Record

BEST AVAILABLE IMAGES

Defective images within this document are accurate representations of the original documents submitted by the applicant.

Defects in the images include but are not limited to the items checked:

- ❑ **BLACK BORDERS**
- ❑ **IMAGE CUT OFF AT TOP, BOTTOM OR SIDES**
- ❑ **FADED TEXT OR DRAWING**
- ❑ **BLURRED OR ILLEGIBLE TEXT OR DRAWING**
- ❑ **SKEWED/SLANTED IMAGES**
- ❑ **COLOR OR BLACK AND WHITE PHOTOGRAPHS**
- ❑ **GRAY SCALE DOCUMENTS**
- ❑ **LINES OR MARKS ON ORIGINAL DOCUMENT**
- ❑ **REFERENCE(S) OR EXHIBIT(S) SUBMITTED ARE POOR QUALITY**
- ❑ **OTHER:** _____

IMAGES ARE BEST AVAILABLE COPY.
As rescanning these documents will not correct the image problems checked, please do not report these problems to the IFW Image Problem Mailbox.

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/785,438	02/20/2001	Richard A. Smith	20-433	5002

7590 08/12/2004

MANELLI DENISON & SELTER PLLC
2000 M Street, N.W., 7th Floor
Washington, DC 20036-3307

EXAMINER	
SUAZO, RAINIER A	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2144	

DATE MAILED: 08/12/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/785,438	SMITH ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Rainier Suazo	2144	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *02/20/2004*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-35* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-35* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *20 February 2001* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date *05/20/2003*.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

This application has been examined. Claims 1-35 presented for examination.

Objections

1. The title of the invention is not descriptive. A new title is required that is clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed.

2. The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because it exceeds the 150 words limit. Correction is required. See MPEP § 608.01(b).

3. Applicant is reminded of the proper content of an abstract of the disclosure.

A patent abstract is a concise statement of the technical disclosure of the patent and should include that which is new in the art to which the invention pertains. If the patent is of a basic nature, the entire technical disclosure may be new in the art, and the abstract should be directed to the entire disclosure. If the patent is in the nature of an improvement in an old apparatus, process, product, or composition, the abstract should include the technical disclosure of the improvement. In certain patents, particularly those for compounds and compositions, wherein the process for making and/or the use thereof are not obvious, the abstract should set forth a process for making and/or use thereof. If the new technical disclosure involves modifications or alternatives, the abstract should mention by way of example the preferred modification or alternative.

The abstract should not refer to purported merits or speculative applications of the invention and should not compare the invention with the prior art.

Where applicable, the abstract should include the following:
(1) if a machine or apparatus, its organization and operation;
(2) if an article, its method of making;
(3) if a chemical compound, its identity and use;
(4) if a mixture, its ingredients;
(5) if a process, the steps.

Extensive mechanical and design details of apparatus should not be given.

4. The use of different trademarks (e.g. Solaris) has been noted in this application. It should be capitalized wherever it appears and be accompanied by the generic terminology. Although the use of trademarks is permissible in patent applications, the proprietary nature of the marks should be respected and every effort made to prevent their use in any manner which might adversely affect their validity as trademarks.

5. It is noted that based on the content of the claims 22, 23, 24 and 25 the claims 24 and 25 are not dependent on claim 22. The examiner assumes, for the purpose of examination, that the claims 24 and 25 depend on claim 23. Appropriate corrections are required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

6. Claims 9, 10, 24 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

7. Claims 9, 10, 24 and 25 recites the limitation "said content" in the 3rd lines of each claim. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102(b)

8. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

9. Claims 1-4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Sizer, II et al. (U.S. Patent Number 6,021,432), hereinafter referenced to as Sizer.

10. Regarding claim 1, Sizer disclosed an invention directed to processing broadcast information by receiving, analyzing and selecting subsets of information corresponding to one or more types of pre-selected information. According to one embodiment, an information processing device comprises a receiver, a processor, a memory, and a playback device. The receiver (data source interface module 202) is receives a broadcast stream comprising a plurality of different types of data (Column 1 lines 55 and 56). The processor (data worker module 200) processes the broadcast stream to capture data corresponding to a selected subset of the different types of data, and storing the captured data to the memory (data event destination module 204a-c) (Column 1 lines 56-61). The playback device is capable of playing back the captured data from the memory. A broadcast stream comprising the pieces of information is generated with a label for each piece. The broadcast stream is transmitted for receipt, processing, and selective capturing by one or more information processing devices, which describes an "event-driven architecture". The selection of pieces of information describes an event-driven function activated by the appropriate match between labels and pre-selected information types. (Abstract, Figures 2 and 3, Column 1lines 45-65, Column 2 lines 1 and 2).

11. Regarding claim 2, Sizer disclosed the "interface with a short messaging system" in the form of an apparatus with means adapted to decode the subset of information for playback in human-perceptible form (Column 7 lines 48-51). See also Column 7 lines 4-25, 34-38, 44-51 and 60-65.

12. Regarding claim 3, Sizer disclosed memory (data event destination module 204a-c) and a processor (data worker module 200) as separate and different components of the invention as depicted in FIG. 2 and explained in column 7 lines 60-65.

13. Regarding claim 4, Sizer disclosed the processor adapted to automatically analyze the broadcast stream to identify a subset of information in the broadcast stream corresponding to the Pre-selected types identified in a personal profile, therefore describing querying actions of a "query engine". According to The American Heritage® Dictionary, Fourth Edition the definition of query (1) is a question or inquiry and (2) to express doubt or uncertainty about (page 1142). The American Heritage® Dictionary further defines inquiry as (3) a close examination of a matter in a search for information or truth (page 716)

14. Since all the limitations of the claimed invention were disclosed by Sizer, claims 1, 2, 3 and 4 are rejected.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102(e)

15. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> (e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) and the Intellectual Property and High Technology Technical Amendments Act of 2002 do not apply when the reference is a U.S. patent resulting

directly or indirectly from an international application filed before November 29, 2000. Therefore, the prior art date of the reference is determined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

16. Claims 1, 3 and 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Schultz et al. (U.S. Patent Number 6,453,339), hereinafter referenced to as Schultz.

17. Regarding claim 1 Schultz disclosed a system and method for presenting data from a plurality of sources to a user. The system includes a plurality of information sources, a user interface (data event destination module 204a-c), content storage and a server (data worker module 200) connected to the user interface and the content storage (Abstract). Schultz depicted in FIG. 3 and described in column 6 lines 9-12, a way to reach the information source trough a slave server (data source interface module 202). The user may be notified via e-mail or message to a channel when a particular event occurs which describes event-driven configurable structure. (Abstract, FIGS. 1-3, column 13 lines 19-31).

18. Regarding claim 3 Schultz disclosed in a data entry device 20 and a server 12 as two separate component of the system 10, therefore describing an abstracted design. (Column 2 lines 57-65).

19. Regarding claim 4 Schultz disclosed the inclusion of a search engine 30 in FIG. 2 and describes its purpose in column 5 lines 24-32.

20. Since all the limitations of the claimed invention were disclosed by Shultz, claims 1, 3 and 4 are rejected.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

21. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

22. Claims 5, 10 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schultz et al. (U.S. Patent Number 6,453,339) in view of International Business Machines Corporation (A Process for Customized Information Delivery), hereinafter referenced to as IBM.

23. Regarding claim 5, Schultz failed to teach a query engine adapted to query a web page for content. IBM teaches that the process in short, is simple: have the user's home PC surf the web for him gathering material; translate the material into audio format; sent the audio to the car and store it; and have the car replay the audio (paragraph 1 lines 4-6). IBM disclosed in details that the web pages are then run through a speech synthesizer to create an audio file (paragraph 6). The advantages of searching the web to find information are well known to one with ordinary skills in the art at the time of the invention and include access to vast amounts of information in fast and low cost manner. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine Schultz with the teachings of IBM to

access the web and gather selected material (query) in the form of web pages to add a different data source at a low cost.

24. Regarding claim 10, Schultz failed to teach a formatter module to format content into XSL-information. IBM teaches that the web pages are then run through a speech synthesizer to create an audio file, therefore describing a module that effectively changes the format of the information or content (paragraph 6 line 1). The advantage of the format change tough by IBM is to provide the user with the information in a way that he/she won't need to use his/her hands and eyes while driving the car. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine Schultz with the teachings of IBM to ease the information retrieval for the user.

25. Regarding claim 14, web pages are created with HTML, therefore its inherited that the information received by the data source interface as disclosed by IBM contains HTML format data (see web page definition in The American Heritage® Dictionary, fourth edition, page 1554).

26. Claim 6, 19 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schultz et al. (U.S. Patent Number 6,453,339) in view of Herz (U.S. Patent Number 6,029,195), hereinafter referenced to as Herz.

27. Schultz failed to teach a query engine adapted to query a database for content. Herz describes a supporting architecture further describing an electronic media system architecture, in which the information is comprised of individual "files", which can contain audio data, video data, graphics data, text data, structured database data and combinations thereof (column 33 lines 43-45). The advantages of searching a database

to find information are well known to one with ordinary skills in the art at the time of the invention and include access to vast amounts of information arranged for ease of retrieval. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine Schultz with the teachings of Herz to query a database for content to add a different data source.

28. Regarding claim 19, Schultz failed to teach a Lotus database. Herz describes a supporting architecture further describing an electronic media system architecture, in which the information is comprised of individual "files", which can contain audio data, video data, graphics data, text data, structured database data and combinations thereof (column 33 lines 43-45). The advantages of searching a Lotus database to find information are well known to one with ordinary skills in the art at the time of the invention and include gaining access to a different data source. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine Schultz with the teachings of Herz to query Lotus database to augment the searchable date sources.

29. Regarding claim 21, Schultz and Herz combined failed to teach the use of XSL. According to its definition XSL is a language that allows describing how files are encoded in XML. It is well know in the art that XSL is a language which allows one to describe how files encoded in the XML standard are to be formatted. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to use or encounter XSL in an environment using XML.

30. Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schultz et al. (U.S. Patent Number 6,453,339) in view of Herz (U.S. Patent Number 6,029,195) hereinafter referenced to as Herz.

31. Regarding claim 7, Schultz failed to teach a query engine adapted to query a database for content using JDBC. The advantages of JDBC, by definition, include: (a) It provides the specification for programs written in JAVA to connect with popular databases and (b) allow to encode access request statements written in Structured Query Language (SQL). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine Schultz with the teachings of Herz to query a database for content using JDBC to gain access to a plurality of popular databases.

32. Regarding claim 8, Schultz failed to teach a query engine adapted to query an e-mail account. Herz describes a supporting architecture further describing an electronic media system architecture, in which the information is comprised of individual "files", which can contain audio data, video data, graphics data, text data, structured database data and combinations thereof (column 33 lines 43-45). The advantages of searching an e-mail account for information are well known to one with ordinary skills in the art at the time of the invention and include access to a different data source. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine Schultz with the teachings of Herz to query e-mail accounts for content, since e-mail accounts are usually stored in databases or other type of searchable electronic files and to add a different data source.

33. Regarding claim 9, Schultz failed to teach a query engine adapted to query a database for content. Herz teaches a system that evaluates the target profiles against the users' target profile interest summaries to generate a user-customized rank ordered listing of target objects (column 1 lines 27-30) and said target objects are described to be electronically stored as text files can include commercially provided news articles, published documents, letters, user-generated documents, descriptions of physical objects, or combinations of these classes of data (column 33 lines 52-56), therefore describing documents in different formats but stored in text format (transformed from their original format) . It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine Schultz with the teachings of Herz to improve information retrieval time by tenderizing the format in which the information is stored.

34. Claims 11,12 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schultz et al. (U.S. Patent Number 6,453,339) hereinafter referenced to as Shultz in view of the definition of XML in The American Heritage® Dictionary, Fourth Edition.

35. Regarding claims 11 and 12, Schultz failed to teach the use of XML information transmitted from the data event destination module or received by the data source interface module; and also fail to teach the use of a protocol converter. According to The American Heritage® Dictionary, XML is a metalanguage written in SGML that allows one to design a markup language and facilitates the exchange of data. Regarding claim 11 and 16, It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify Schultz teachings to use a widely known language

such as XML to facilitate data exchange and resend the user the information in an uniform format. Regarding claim 12, since the invention is conceived to retrieve information form a plurality of data sources It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to use a protocol converter to provide a single protocol transmission. Regarding claim 16, since the invention is conceived to retrieve information form a plurality of data sources It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to retrieve the requested information using a widely known language such as XML to facilitate data exchange.

36. Claims 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sizer, II et al. (U.S. Patent Number 6,021, 432) in view of the definition of XML in The American Heritage® Dictionary, Fourth Edition and further in view of McConnell et al. (An Experimental 4-Mb Flash EEPROM with Sector Erase) hereinafter referenced to as McConnell.

37. Sizer failed to teach the use of XML data stream been read by the data event destination module one byte at a time. According to embodiments of Sizer invention a person passing trough an airport is able to retrieve messages that are addressed specifically to him or her. Software within device is programmed to sift through large amounts of data. In one embodiment, information processing device 104 is a portable device that also provides the functionality of a personal paging device. McConnell teaches memory that may be programmed 1 byte at a time while describing an experimental EEPROM flashing process on 4-Mbs density flash memories. Portable

devices do not incorporate large amounts of resource due to space constraints and other limitations. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine Sizer with McConnell or with common knowledge in the art to read large amounts of data sub-dividing said data for transmission or processing to overcome hardware limitations.

38. Claim 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schultz et al. (U.S. Patent Number 6,453,339) in view of Herz (U.S. Patent Number 6,029,195), hereinafter referenced to as Herz.

39. Schultz failed to teach a query of an e-mail account using IMAP protocol. Herz describes a supporting architecture further describing an electronic media system architecture, in which the information is comprised of individual "files", which can contain audio data, video data, graphics data, text data, structured database data and combinations thereof (column 33 lines 43-45). The advantages of searching an e-mail account to find information are well known to one with ordinary skills in the art at the time of the invention and include gaining access to a different data source. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine Schultz with the teachings of Herz to query e-mail accounts using IMAP since IMAP a standard protocol used to access e-mail account on local area networks.

40. Claim 17 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schultz et al. (U.S. Patent Number 6,453,339) in view of Herz (U.S. Patent Number 6,029,195),

hereinafter referenced to as Herz and further in view of Kantor et al. (Request for Comments: 977, Network Working Group) hereinafter referenced to as Kantor.

41. Schultz failed to teach a news serve as a data source. Herz teaches a system that receives articles for storage in the mass storage systems of the information servers (column 62 lines 47-55). Those articles are described as to be online and available from a wide variety of sources such as the AP or Reuters (column 63 lines 26-28). Shultz invention would result to be improved if combined with Herz teachings by adding additional data sources to be searched. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine Schultz with the teachings of Herz to augment the searchable data sources. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to use NNTP to communicate with a "news server" since it is a well know protocol used to transfer articles between servers (Request for Comments: 977, Sections 1.2-1.4).

42. Claim 18 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schultz et al. (U.S. Patent Number 6,453,339) in view of Small et al. (Request for Comments: 2739, Network Working Group) hereinafter referenced to as Small.

43. Schultz failed to teach a vcalendar as a data source. Small teaches clients that are capable of retrieving information from calendaring and scheduling systems (section 1.1). Shultz invention would result to be improved if combined with Small teachings by adding additional data sources to be searched. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine Schultz with the teachings of Small to augment the searchable date sources.

44. Claim 20 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schultz et al. (U.S. Patent Number 6,453,339) in view of Macera et al. (U.S. Patent Number 5,490,252), hereinafter referenced to as Macera.

45. Schultz failed to teach a SNMP MIB as a data source. Macera teaches a system wherein through extensions to the SNMP MIB, information can be collected describing every element of the BES network including all supported network-layer protocols and network circuit types (column 8 lines 62-65). Shultz invention would result to be improved if combined with Macera teachings by adding additional data sources to be searched. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine Schultz with the teachings of Macera to augment the searchable date sources.

46. Claim 22 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schultz et al. (U.S. Patent Number 6,453,339), hereinafter referenced to as Schultz in view of Reed et al. (U.S. Patent Number 6,088,717), hereinafter referenced to as Reed.

47. Schultz failed to teach the adapted data worker capable of generating an event listener capable to be activated at behest of the user. Reed teaches a communication system that allows users to receive an e-mail notification from a database agent monitoring the database when a new entry or a certain condition has been made in that database (column 6 lines 62-66). Reed teaches that data exchange event initiated either manually by the consumer or automatically (column 76 lines 8 and 9). Shultz invention would result to be improved if combined with Reed teachings by adding additional a flexible monitoring (event listener) functionality that can be activated

automatically or at user behest. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine Shultz and Reed to provide the user the monitoring functionality and the manually triggered activation of said monitoring functionality.

48. Claim 23, 24 and 25 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schultz et al. (U.S. Patent Number 6,453,339), hereinafter referenced to as Schultz, in view of Reed et al. (U.S. Patent Number 6,088,717), hereinafter referenced to as Reed as applied to claim 22 above, and further in view of von-Bultzingloewen et al. (Active Information Delivery In A CORBA-Based Distributed Information System) hereinafter von-Bultzingloewen.

49. Schultz combined with Reed failed to teach a data destination filter. von-Bultzingloewen teaches a process to monitor database value changes, upon the detection of a change three CLIPS rules are executed. The first one to indicate that an event has occurred, effectively detecting "a change in content". The second one to querying the changed value and creating a fact. A third one to compare the new value to a limit value to determine if no action will proceed or if a notification will be sent, effectively detecting "a particular change in the content" and determining or "filtering" the action to be taken (page 225 paragraphs 1 and 2). Shultz combined with Reed would result to be improved if combined with von-Bultzingloewen teachings by adding the advantage of different actions depending on the event that is monitored. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to

combine Shultz, Reed and von-Bultzingloewen to provide the user the monitoring functionality and different reactions to different events results.

50. Claims 26, 30, 31 and 35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zirngibl et al. (U.S. Patent Number 6,606,596), hereinafter referenced to as Zirngibl in view of Schultz et al. (U.S. Patent Number 6,453,339), hereinafter referenced to as Schultz.

51. Zirngibl disclosed a system and method for the creation and automatic deployment of personalized, dynamic and interactive voice services, including information derived from on-line analytical processing (OLAP) systems and other data repositories. According to one of the disclosed embodiments Zirngibl disclosed that once a voice service is created, the system monitors predetermined conditions to determine when the voice service should be executed (event listener). Each voice service is executed when one or more predetermined conditions are met as specified during creation of the voice service. For example, a voice service may be executed according to a predetermined schedule or based on a triggering event (e.g., one or more conditions are met based on the output of an OLAP or other report). In the OLAP report implies the monitoring of a particular source and scheduled of triggered actions represent means for automatically and periodically executing an actions. When the predetermined condition is satisfied, the voice service is executed. Executing a voice service includes the steps of generating the content specified by the voice service and the user preferences. Some users may have identical personalization options and, thus, a single call structure may be generated for a group of users with identical

personalization options. The content of the voice service includes the information that is to be delivered (directed) to users of that voice service, and the Input to be requested from the user, among other things. The content may include, for example, static text messages, dynamic content (e.g., text based on information output from an OLAP report, other database or other sources) or blended text (e.g., static text combined with dynamic content). One of the embodiments described by Zirngibl comprise connection lines computer networks, where it is evident that the monitoring and receiving devices are independent or abstract (Abstract, FIG. 10, column 2 lines 44-65, column 7 lines 19-27, column 8 lines 6-15 and column 27 lines 14-57). Zirngibl failed to teach a system or method that specifically direct the content to the same device that makes the request. Schultz disclosed a system wherein a data entry device includes a user interface that allows the user to select data in an individualized way. The advantages of implementing Shultz invention with a device capable of performing both functions included reducing costs, space and learning time for the user. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine the inventions to modify Zirngibl with the teachings of Shultz to get the advantages of a single device performing both functions.

52. Claims 27 and 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zirngibl et al. (U.S. Patent Number 6,606,596), hereinafter referenced to as Zirngibl in view of Daswani et al. (U.S. Patent Number 6,477,565), hereinafter referenced to as Daswani.

53. Zirngibl failed to teach the use of a wireless network in the invention. Daswani disclosed a system wherein a data center accesses the Internet and a wireless network that includes a notebook computer. (Abstract, FIG 1, Column 6 lines 1-26). The advantages of accessing to wireless networks as taught by Daswani would include, but are not limited to, the utilization of a satellite links to overcome large geographical distances. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify Zirngibl with the teachings of Daswani to access a wireless network to retrieve data from databases and applications residing in such network exploiting the advantages of such access.

54. Claims 28, 29, 33 and 34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zirngibl et al. (U.S. Patent Number 6,606,596), hereinafter referenced to as Zirngibl in view of von-Bultzingloewen et al. (Active Information Delivery In A CORBA-Based Distributed Information System) hereinafter von-Bultzingloewen.

55. Zirngibl failed to define a change in content or a presence of a parameter as triggering events. von-Bultzingloewen disclosed in their paper a monitoring system that focuses on monitoring the change in content of a data source, which is an event that triggers a content analysis process. The content is then analyzed as a parameter against a threshold rule, which can be a trigger for a second event (Pages 220-225). One of the advantages monitoring the changes in content and using it as parameters is the capability to automate manual reviewing of data thus enhancing the accuracy and reducing the time required for reviewing data. It would have been obvious for one with

ordinary skills in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Zirngibl and von-Bultzingloewen to incorporate the advantages of more accurate and faster results to Zirngibl.

56. Claim 35 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zirngibl et al. (U.S. Patent Number 6,606,596), hereinafter referenced to as Zirngibl in view of von-Bultzingloewen et al. (Active Information Delivery In A CORBA-Based Distributed Information System) hereinafter von-Bultzingloewen, as applied to claim 31, and in further view of Reed et al. (U.S. Patent Number 6,088,717), hereinafter referenced to as Reed.

57. Zirngibl combined with von-Bultzingloewen failed to teach means for automatically and periodically directing content to a destination device. Reed teaches a communication system that allows users to receive an e-mail notification from a database agent monitoring the database when a new entry or a certain condition has been made in that database (column 6 lines 62-66). Reed teaches that data exchange event initiated either manually by the consumer or automatically by scheduled events (column 76 lines 3-10). Zirngibl combined with von-Bultzingloewen would result to be improved if combined with Reed teachings to provide the user the monitoring functionality and the automatically triggered activation of said monitoring functionality.

58. Since all the limitations of the claimed invention were disclosed by Shultz, claims 5-12 and 14-35 are rejected.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

U.S. Patent no. 6,272,531 B1 by Shrader teaches a method for recognizing and acting upon dynamic data in a computer network such as the Internet.

U.S. Patent no. 6,421,716 B1 by Eldridge et al. teaches a system performing document services using mobile computing devices.

U.S. Patent no. 6,460,036 B1 by Herz et al. teaches a system related to customized electronic identification of desirable objects.

U.S. Patent no. 5,754,939 by Herz et al. teaches a system related to customized electronic identification of desirable objects, in an electronic media environment.

U.S. Patent no. 6,266,614 by Alumbaugh teaches a travel guide device including a GPS receiver and access to a database of points-of-interest.

U.S. Patent no. 5,461,390 by Hoshen teaches a locator device for monitoring the location of subjects, usable in conjunction with a database system connected to a wireless network.

U.S. Patent no. 5,767,795 by Schaphorst teaches an electronic guide with a system including a GPS receiver, a computer and database.

U.S. Patent no. 5,893,091 by Hunt et al. teaches a method for distributing timely information over a computer network.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Rainier Suazo whose telephone number is (703) 305-3887. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday, 8:00-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, William Cuchlinski can be reached on (703) 308-3873. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



WILLIAM A. CUCHLINSKI, JR.
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600